

Sub 7  
E2  
B2  
8. (Amended) A system for reducing reflection from a surface of an optical lens comprising:

vane means for limiting reflections from said surface while maintaining a substantially wide Field of View (FOV) for said optical lens; said vane means for mounting proximate said surface of said optical lens; and said vane means producing tubes with a length-to-width ratio greater than the length-to-width ratio of the FOV. 112, 12

B3  
Please add the following claim:

11. The apparatus of claim 1, wherein said first ends of said plurality of vanes are spaced apart from each other at a fixed distance and said second ends of said plurality of vanes are spaced apart from each other at a fixed distance.

#### REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application and request reconsideration of the subject application based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1 to 10 are pending in the subject application. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended for clarification purposes. Claim 11 has been added. The amendments to the claims and added claim 11 are supported by the originally filed disclosure. Favorable reconsideration in light of the amendments and the remarks which follow is respectfully requested.

#### 1. 35 USC §102 Rejection

Claims 8-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jones (U.S. Patent No. 4,929,055, of record) for the reasons set out in the previous Office Action (Paper No. 2, page 5).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As clarified in amended claim 8, the vane means produce tubes with a length-to-width ratio greater than the length to width ratio of the FOV.

Jones (U.S. Patent No. 4,929,055), does not describe, teach or suggest this type of an arrangement. Rather, Jones' device includes vanes, in a honeycomb configuration, that produce tubes with a length-to-width ratio that does not exceed the length-to-width ratio of the FOV. The length-to-width ratio of such tubes in such a device is not deep enough to give good glint protection for a wide FOV lens surface. Applicant has recognized an existing problem: how to get tubes long enough to provide effective glint protection without vignetting the view through an optic having a wide FOV. The present invention is directed towards solving this problem.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is patentable over the Jones reference. Claim 9 depends from claim 8, and, likewise is patentable over the Jones reference.

The Softly document also clearly does not suggest vane means producing tubes with a length-to width ratio greater than the length to width ratio of the FOV, as recited in Applicant's claim 8.

## 2. 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claims 1-7 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones (U.S. Patent No. 4,929,055) in view of Softly (U.S. Patent No. 4,365,866).

The Office states that:

[I]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the optical apparatus having a plurality of concentric circular vanes in combination with radial vanes as provided by Jones by rearranging the ends facing the lens surface of an optical lens of the vanes closer to each other with respect to the opposite ends of the vanes as suggested by Softly for the purpose of increasing the reduction of reflected light.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The references teach away from their combination. Further, the combination suggested by the Office would render the device of Softly inoperable.

The Softly reference describes “a light masking device for improving image contrast on a television or similar video display screen under conditions of high ambient light.” (Col. 1, lines 4-7) The light masking device is formed of a plurality of:

elongated planar slats extending horizontally across the width of the screen, the slats being differentially inclined from the horizontal in the directions of their widths so as to converge on a horizontal line at a selected height and a selected distance from the screen. (Col. 1, lines 42-46)

Further,

In a preferred embodiment of the invention the slats are pivotally connected to the support frame for pivotal movement about respective horizontal axes, and means are provided for differentially adjusting the inclinations of the slats for selectively adjusting the position of the horizontal line on which the inclined slats converge. (Col. 1, lines 47-52)

This type of adjustability is an important feature because if the slats are not adjustable, then the slats converge at a set horizontal line at a set height and distance from the screen. However, by making the slats adjustable, a range of camera positions may be suited. (See Col. 2, line 66 - Col. 3, line 5) “Since the slats are planar and have parallel edges, they must always lie in planes converging on a horizontal line despite such adjustment.” (Col. 21-23)

Thus, according to the Softly reference, the slats must lie in planes converging on a horizontal line. Any other arrangement of the slats is expressly taught away from. Further, if the Softly reference was combined with the Jones reference so as to form slats “having a plurality of concentric circular vanes in combination with radial vanes,” then the slats could not be made adjustable, which is an object of the Softly reference, as discussed above. Concentric circular vanes will not pivot without

breaking. Further, a plurality of concentric circular vanes in combination with radial vanes makes it further impossible for the vanes to pivot.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Jones (U.S. Patent No. 4,929,055) in view of Softly (U.S. Patent No. 4,365,866). Claims 2-7 and 10 depend from claim 1 and, likewise are patentable over Jones in view of Softly.

Applicant also notes regarding claim 10, that Softly expressly teaches away from vanes positioned such that the "first ends of said plurality of vanes are spaced closer apart from each other than said second ends of said plurality of vanes." Softly, as noted above, requires that the slats be positioned so as to "converge on a horizontal line at a selected height and a selected distance from the screen." (Col. 1, lines 42-46) This expressly requires that the slats be positioned such that the first ends are spaced farther apart from each other than said second ends.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and discussion, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-10 is respectfully requested. This case is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Applicant respectfully requests early consideration and allowance of the subject application.


**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Peter W. J. Jones  
U.S.S.N.: 09/094,052  
Page 6

If for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 23, 2000



Lisa Swiszc Hazzard (Reg. No. 44,368)  
Peter F. Corless (Reg. No. 33,860)  
DIKE, BRONSTEIN, ROBERTS &  
CUSHMAN, LLP  
130 Water Street  
Boston, MA 02109-4280  
(617) 523-3400

#137724

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**